The Evolution of the Hiramic Legend in England and France

Joannes A. M. Snoek, 32°

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hiramic Legend is, no doubt, the most important myth of Freemasonry. It forms the background against which the last of the three Craft Degrees (that of Master Mason), as well as several of the so-called higher degrees are situated. Therefore, a study of its development is certainly justified.

Fascinating as it is, I shall not dwell here on the question of the origin of the Hiramic Legend, but just start with the first written version available to us and from there follow its development in England and France during a period of about a century.[1] In order to arrive at the more interesting results, it is necessary to start with an exposition of the two dimensions which set up the field of material we will be looking at.

In the first place there is the story itself. Despite the many variations, it is possible to recognize the global structure of the story, displayed in all its actual versions. I shall present that first.

The other dimension is that of the texts used. In order to study the evolution of a particular story, it is necessary to look at a collection of its versions that is as complete as possible. For this particular study, I collected some fifty

versions of the Hiramic Legend. The next thing I therefore have to do is to present that collection.

When these two dimensions of the field have been presented, we shall look at the results of my research. However, the sheer size of the corpus involved makes it impossible to present all conclusions that can be drawn from it here. So I shall restrict myself to one aspect only, namely that which is related directly to the issue of descents and borrowings. In other words, I shall try to outline the global developments and to show which text borrowed what from which older ones. Special attention will be paid to the classical question whether the developments in England and France were independent or not.

II. The Global Structure of the Hiramic Legend

Hiram or Adoniram?

Some of the French versions of the Hiramic Legend are either preceded by or start with a discussion of who the hero of the story was and what was his real name.[2] It is then always stated in the first place that he was not Hiram, the king of Tyre, which is clear.[3] As a rule, however, when such discussions are included, it is also postulated that he was also not Hiram, the admirable worker in metals who forged the two pillars in front of the temple of Solomon and the other objects in brass, silver and gold, made for that temple.[4] It is concluded then that the person involved is the architect of the temple, which the Bible (according to our sources) calls not Hiram but Adoniram. As a result, some of the versions of the Hiramic Legend call the hero Adoniram, rather than the more usual Hiram or Hiram Abiff. In most cases, however, it is clearly assumed that Hiram, the worker in metals, was the same as the architect of the temple.

I regard this discussion, though related to it, not a part of the Hiramic Legend itself. It is rather a discussion about it. Therefore, I will not return to it here.

David, Solomon, Treasures, Workmen

Some of the French versions[5] include the story, derived from the Bible and Flavius Josephus, of David's intention to build the temple, how he received the plans from the Lord, why the Lord finally did not allow him to build it, that Solomon inherited both the kingdom and the obligation to build the temple, how many treasures were amassed for it, how many workmen were involved, and so on.

This part of the story may vary from a few lines, up to almost a letter-sized page of text,[6] but it outlines the context within which the Hiramic Legend takes place, rather than being an integral part of it. Also, whereas the previously mentioned discussion concerning the name of the architect, is clearly copied and adapted from version to version, this part of the story is usually not. It seems rather the product of the individual compilers' creativity and initiative. So, I will not return to this part of the story either.

1. Building the Temple

The first part of the Hiramic Legend proper, but nevertheless missing in some versions, describes how Solomon, wishing to start the building of his temple, asks his neighbor, ally and friend Hiram, king of Tyre, to help him. Hiram agrees and sends, besides the cedars from the Lebanon necessary for the building of the Temple, also the Master Builder Hiram or Hiram Abif(f), "a widow's son of the tribe of Naphtali, and his father was a man of Tyre" (1 Kings 7:14). Solomon appoints Hiram Abiff as the superintendent and architect of the whole enterprise. Because many workmen are involved, Hiram divides them in three classes: Apprentices, Fellow-Crafts, and Masters. Since the salary of each class was different, Hiram decided that each would get his pay at a different location and he provided them with ways to identify themselves as belonging to the class of which they demanded the salary. The Apprentices were paid at the column Jachin, which name was also their word of recognition. Besides that, they had a sign and a grip to distinguish themselves. The Fellow-Crafts were paid at the column Boaz, which name was their word of recognition, and they too had a distinguishing sign and grip. The Masters were paid in the Middle Chamber and had only a word to distinguish themselves. These measures had excellent results and the work prospered.

2. Hiram's Death

The second part tells that three Fellow-Crafts, however, were not content. They wished to receive the wages of a Master Mason. Thus they decided to force Hiram to tell them the Masters' Word. Each day at noon, when the workmen had gone to refresh themselves, Hiram went into the Middle Chamber to pray to the Lord and to inspect the works. Because that was the only time when they would find Hiram alone, the three conspirators decided to hide in the temple and await his return, each of them posted at one of the three doors. Hiram came in through the West door. When he wanted to leave through the

South door, one of the ruffians asked him for the Masters' Word, threatening to kill him if he would not give it. Hiram, however, refused, whereupon the ruffian gave him a blow with the object he held in his hand. Hiram, hurt but not dead, tried to escape through the West door, where the same happened again. Finally trying to escape through the East door, and again refusing to give the Masters' Word, the third ruffian struck him so heavily on the head that he died. The three conspirators thereupon buried the body of Hiram, hoping that their action would remain unnoticed.

3. Finding Hiram

In the third part of the story, Solomon, missing Hiram after some days, sent out several men to search for their Master. Suspecting what might have happened, either Solomon or these men also decided that, if Hiram was found dead, the first word spoken would be the new Masters' Word, replacing the old one. Three of these searchers did find the body of Hiram. One tried to raise him with the grip of an Apprentice, but (the skin of) the finger he grasped came off. Another tried to raise him with the grip of a Fellow-Craft, with the same result. A third one then took his right wrist with his right hand, and, foot to foot, knee to knee, breast to breast, and supporting the back of Hiram with his left hand, he raised the Master. While doing so, he exclaimed: "Makbenak," which, according to the legend, means, "the flesh falls from the bones." This became thus the new Masters' Word. Thereupon the body of Hiram was brought to Jerusalem, into the Temple.

4. The Murderers Found

In the fourth part of the story, occurring in some versions, three other searchers found instead of Hiram the three Fellow-Crafts who had killed him. These murderers called out lamentations of the form, "I wish that I had been killed in such and such a manner, rather than that I had been the cause of the death of our Master Hiram." The three searchers caught the murderers and brought them to Jerusalem and before Solomon, who sentenced them according to the punishments they had wished for themselves.

5. Hiram Buried

Finally, in the fifth and last part of the legend, Solomon ordered Hiram to be interred with great ceremony in the Temple, according to some versions in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. Those who had sought him were present, dressed in white aprons and white gloves as a token of their innocence. Solomon also ordered

that a golden triangle, with the old Masters' Word, the Name of God in Hebrew, be placed on the tomb of Hiram.

We stop thus far in this outline of the Hiramic Legend. As we shall see, in some parts there exist some major, mutually exclusive, varieties of the story. I have tried to leave these aside for the moment. However, elements which are sometimes present, and sometimes not, I have included in order to sketch as full a picture of the story as possible.

III. THE COLLECTION OF TEXTS

1. English Catechisms, 1696–1730

The earliest version of the Hiramic Legend is found in Samuel Prichard's *Masonry Dissected* from 1730. This exposure belongs to the group of texts from between 1696 and 1730, partly manuscripts, partly printed, which are generally referred to as "the early Masonic catechisms," not to be confused with the book by Douglas Knoop, G. P. Jones, and Douglas Hamer by the same name. *Masonry Dissected* is the last one published in this group. After that, it takes until 1760 before other Masonic exposures are published in England.

One other text from the Early Masonic Catechisms will turn out to be important in the context of our subject, namely the *Graham Manuscript* of 1726. It contains a Noah Legend, similar to the Hiramic Legend. This may have played the same role in the third degree ritual, before that, possibly under the influence of the publication of *Masonry Dissected*, the Hiramic Legend became the standard.

2. French Exposures, 1738–1751

Meanwhile, exposures appear in French, roughly in the 1740s. Those including information on the Hiramic Legend are:

- Anonymous, *La Réception Mystérieuse* of 1738, which is a French translation of Prichard;
- Abbé Gabriel Louis Calabre Perau, *Le Secret des Francs-Maçons* of 1744;[7]
- Leonard Gabanon (Louis Travenol), *Catéchisme des Francs-Maçons* of 1744;
- Anonymous, *Le Sceau Rompu* of 1745;
- Anonymous, *L'Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi* of 1745;

- Leonard Gabanon (Louis Travenol), *La Désolation des Entrepreneurs Modernes du Temple de Jérusalem* of 1747;
- Anonymous, *L'Anti-Maçon* of 1748; and
- Thomas Wolson (pseudonym), *Le Maçon Démasqué* of 1751.

3. The English Exposures, 1760–1769

The next wave of printed, anonymous exposures appears in England in the 1760s. It starts in 1760 with *A Master-key to Free-Masonry*, an abridged translation of *Le Secret des Francs-Maçons*. Originally English exposures were then:

- *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760;
- *Jachin and Boaz* of 1762;
- *Hiram or the Grand Master-Key* of 1764;
- *The Mystery of Free Masonry Explained* of 1765;
- *Shibboleth* of 1765;
- *Mahhabone, or The Grand Lodge Door Open'd* of 1766; and
- *The Free-Mason Stripped Naked* of 1769; while

Solomon in all his Glory of 1766 was a translation of *Le Maçon Démasqué*.

4. A few Intermediate Prints

Between this wave of the 1760s and the later "Grand Rituals" appear only a few printed texts with rituals of the Craft Degrees. Those of which I know are:

- Nerad. Herono (Honoré Renard), *Les trois premiers grad. uniform. de la maç.* of 1778;
- Louis Guillemain de St. Victor, *Recueil Précieux de la Maçonnerie Adonhiramite* of 1785;
- Anonymous, *Recueil des trois premier grades de la Maçonnerie* of 1788 and
- John Browne, *Master Key*, printed in cipher, of which the first edition, containing catechism questions only, appeared in 1798, and the second edition, including the answers as well, in 1802.

5. The "Grand Rituals"

The developments resulted in the publication of the four "Grand Rituals."

- In 1782, the rituals of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* (Rectified Scottish Rite), written by Jean Baptiste Willermoz and accepted by the Convent of Wilhelmsbad, were published as: *Rituel du grade* [*d'apprenti, de compagnon, et*] *de maître franc-maçon pour le régime de la maçonnerie rectifiée redigé en Convent General de l'Ordre en Aout 5782*.

- Next were the rituals of the *Rite Moderne* or *Rite Français*. Written by a committee, they were accepted by the Grand Orient de France in 1786. The next year they were copied and sent to all lodges of the Grand Orient. The first printed edition of the rituals appeared in 1801 under the title: *Le Régulateur du Maçon*.

- The origin of the rituals of the Craft Degrees of the *Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite* remains unclear.[8] The rite developed in the West Indies at the end of the 18th and in the first years of the 19th century into a system of thirty-three degrees. The rituals of the "high degrees" included in the system are known to be mainly of French origin. The first Supreme Council was officially founded in 1801 in Charleston, South Carolina. After the comte de Grasse-Tilly had brought this *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* to France in 1804, the rituals of the Craft Degrees were printed in about 1815 under the title *Guide des Maçons Ecossais, ou Cahier des trois grades Symboliques du Rit Ancien et Accepté*.[9] The printed version of the rituals formulates the first toast as to "Sa Majesté et son auguste famille" (His majesty and his august family). This may refer to Napoleon as well as to Louis XVIII. Considering that the allegiance of the Masons changed three times in a few months during the hectic years 1814 and 1815, the absence of a precise indication as to who was the monarch to be toasted, probably was mere prudence. It suggests that the publication was printed during those few years after the fall of Napoleon (1814) when the political situation remained insecure; let us say 1814 to 1817 or so.[10]

- Finally, after the union of the two competing English Grand Lodges in 1813 into the United Grand Lodge of England, this organization approved in 1816 the rituals, demonstrated by the Lodge of Reconciliation. After this lodge had been resolved, several Lodges of Instruction were constituted, among which Stability in 1817 and Emulation in 1823. The earliest printed

versions of these rituals appeared in 1825, 1835, and 1838, all three representing the Emulation working.

Since virtually all later Masonic rituals are based on one of these four "Grand Rituals," I have chosen them as the end of the developments I will try to trace.

6. Manuscript Rituals

Almost all the previous rituals are rather well known to the average student of Masonic ritual. However, there are at some places rather large gaps between the years of publication of these printed rituals. Therefore I have tried to locate well-dated manuscript rituals and other materials, either or not published in recent years, to complement the printed ones. I shall present here only the three oldest sources I found.

- *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*, an English, rather deviant, ritual of about 1740.
- *The Confessions of John Coustos*, made before the Portuguese Inquisition on 21 March, 1743, generally assumed to represent the workings of the lodge in Paris of which he was a member and Master between 1735 and 1740, but, as we shall see, also betraying influences from the workings in the lodge in London of which he was a member before he moved to Paris. In fact, John Coustos himself declared that he "learned all the matter … explained in the Kingdom of England."
- *Ecossais Anglois ou le parfait Maitre Anglois*, probably from between 1745 and 1750; which claims to be a French translation of an English ritual. Internal evidence, as well as the results of the research presented here, support this claim.

Besides these, there is a rather large number of French manuscripts from the period 1760 to 1803. For these, the reader is referred to the appendix.

IV. DESCENTS AND BORROWINGS

Having now an idea of the general outline of the Hiramic Legend, as well as of the texts concerned, we can proceed to investigate the differences between the texts. Though for purposes of establishing relationships between texts, minor differences as well as similarities in the precise wording of a particular phrase may be of crucial importance, I will concentrate on those differ-

ences that betray a shift of plot or of argumentation, in other words, a shift in the contents of the story.

1. Building the Temple

The first part of the Hiramic Legend proper, describing the organization of the building of the Temple, shows hardly any development and thus is of little interest to us. The only thing important to mention is that John Coustos declares in 1743 that "to [Hiram] alone was revealed the Sign which pertained to him as Master, in order thus to be differentiated from the other and inferior officers who worked in the same undertaking." Though John Coustos' report is generally assumed to represent the working of his lodge in Paris between 1735 and 1740, this may in fact well represent an aspect of the working of the lodge in London, of which he was a member before 1735, because all 18th century French texts assume a rather large group of Masters, while according to *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760, and all the other English texts of the 1760s, Hiram says to one of his extortionists that "it was not in his Power to deliver [the Masters' Word] alone, except Three together, *viz. Solomon,* King of *Israel; Hiram,* King of *Tyre*; and *Hiram Abiff*," which implies that these were the only Masters. The second edition of Browne's *Master Key* of 1802 also states that "At the building of king Solomon's temple, there were but three grandmasters, namely Solomon, king of Israel, Hiram king of Tyre, and Hiram Abiff," and that to his extortionists Hiram declared "that there were only two in the world besides himself, who knew [the secrets of a Master Mason] (namely Solomon king of Israel, Hiram king of Tyre and Hiram Abiff)." So this characteristic seems to be specific for the English texts.

2. Hiram's Death

The second part of the Hiramic Legend describes how Hiram was killed. With Prichard, there are only three conspirators, "suppos'd to be Three Fellow-Crafts." The number of Brothers who were later sent out by Solomon to search for Hiram is fifteen, but there is no relation mentioned between them and the conspirators, nor whether they were Apprentices, Fellows, or Masters. Finally, Solomon ordered "that 15 Fellow-Crafts … should attend [Hiram's] Funeral," but again there is no relation indicated between these fifteen Fellow-Crafts and either the conspirators or the searchers.

John Coustos mentioned in 1743 that "some of the Officers or Apprentices … desiring to learn the secret sign which [Hiram] had, three of the said Officers [hatched the plot]." This opens the possibility that it is assumed here that sev-

eral others at first were involved as well, but later withdrew. This again may well represent an aspect of the working of his lodge in London, because all 18th century French texts mention only three Fellow-Crafts as conspirators, while *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760 opens with:

> There were Fifteen Fellow-Crafts, finding the Temple almost finish'd, and they had not received the Master's Word, because their Time was not come, therefore they agreed to extort them from their Master *Hiram* the first Opportunity, that they might pass for Masters in other Countries, and have Masters Wages; but Twelve of these Crafts recanted, and the other Three were resolv'd to carry it on....

From then on, all English texts follow this version. So, the general rule is that the English texts from 1760 onwards have fifteen conspirators of which 12 withdraw to leave three, while the French and pre-1760 English texts have only three conspirators.

To this rule there are a few exceptions. The English ritual of the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740 mentions only two conspirators; the French text, *Passus Tertius*, by Th. Gardet de la Garde from 1766, has only one murderer; and *Le Vray Maçon* from 1786 has nine (three groups of three each) while we would expect three in each case. Browne's *Master Key* mentions in both editions only three while we would expect fifteen. The only French text following the English pattern on this point is the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*. This is a first indication that the Craft rituals of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* are English, rather than French oriented. We shall see this confirmed several times. If we accept the declaration of John Coustos as an intermediate, we may conclude that the English pattern developed slowly between 1730 and 1760.

In itself, the two points mentioned thus far may seem of rather minor importance, but they gain relevance in combination with the next topics.

3. Finding Hiram

We now come to the third part of the Hiramic Legend, the finding of the body of Hiram. Prichard states that

> Fifteen Loving Brothers, by Order of King *Solomon*, went out of the West Door of the Temple [to search for Hiram], and divided themselves from Right to Left within Call of each other; and they agreed that if they did not find the Word in him or about him, the first Word should be the Master's Word.

In view of later developments, we should note two things: in the first place it is not specified who these fifteen brothers were, and, secondly, it is they who decide to change the Masters' Word, though they have in fact no reason to suspect that Hiram is dead, let alone that he is murdered and why. Since this is not logical, it asks for a better solution. The English ritual of the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740 resolves the problem thus. The (three) brothers who are sent out to search for Hiram find a corpse and report this to Solomon, who then responds:

> Alas, dear Brethren, we are now satisfied that you have discovered the grave of our worthy Grand Master. Soon after your departure, my Brethren, a Tyrian from the quarries reported to us, that two Fellow-Craftsmen had waited upon our worthy Grand Master a short time before his death, and demanded the secrets of a Master Mason from him, to whom of course he replied, that he could not impart them to any one, having entered into a covenant with the King of Tyre not to reveal the same in his absence, but that immediately after the dedication of the Temple all worthy and faithful Fellow-Craftsmen would be rewarded therewith. Angry at this reply they returned to the quarries, but meeting the Tyrian, they related the matter to him, and confessed to a diabolical plot of waylaying our worthy Grand Master, and extorting from him the Master Masons' word. He, the Tyrian, endeavoured to persuade them from so vile a course, but they assured him that they had resolved upon executing their plans at all hazard, and in return they taunted him with being no loyal subject of Tyre, since our worthy Grand Master, as they most falsely asserted, contemplated by means of his Craftsmen, which was generally known, nothing less than a usurpation of the crown of King Hiram. Upon this saying the Tyrian was mightily troubled, and fearing lest indeed they might denounce him as a rebel to his Sovereign, he consented to keep their counsels secret, although he approved not of their conspiracy. It is then, alas! too true that our venerable Grand Master has been most foully slain, and slain too by his own Fellow-Craftsmen. But the miscreants have fled, they have forfeited all claim to that which they might have obtained—they have become wanderers on the face of the earth, and are for ever accursed.

To this, one of the searchers replies: "Sire, our Grand Master Hiram Abif being dead, I very much fear the most sacred and mysterious word may be lost." This is now a logical reaction. Surprising is, however, that what follows now is not in line with the account of Prichard. For Solomon answers:

> I hope not, my Brother; we permitted him, it is true, after the casting of the pillars of J[achin] and B[oaz], to engrave the most mysterious word

> upon a plate of gold within the cabalistic figure of our signet, and to wear it as an especial mark of our royal favour and goodwill, and I doubt not that it remains with him. Let us however proceed to his grave and examine for ourselves.

Which is then done, and indeed, of course, the "gold medal, whereon is engraved a double triangle enclosed within a circle, and in the midst of which … [is the tetragrammaton]" is found. This solution to the problem, though worked out later in some of the so called "higher degrees," was not adopted in any other version of the Hiramic Legend in our collection.

In 1743, John Coustos makes the first step in another direction: once the fifteen searchers found a body, they implicitly recognized it as "the body of the Master." This was reported to Solomon, who ordered "the Officers and Apprentices" to "disinter the body." Now, knowing that Hiram was dead, they decided

> that if on the body of the Master, or in his pockets, they did not find the means of ascertaining what the signs were which pertained to him in his capacity as Master, they would follow the course of using the first word and sign which they used to each other after they had used those normally employed as Officers and Apprentices.

This decision is in line with the account of Prichard, but is more logical since they now at least know that Hiram is dead, though they do not know why he was murdered. In that respect this version is less convincing than the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*. Notice also that John Coustos still refers to the possibility that they might find "on the body of the Master, or in his pockets, … the means of ascertaining what the signs were which pertained to him in his capacity as Master." That recalls Prichard's "in him or about him." In that respect, John Coustos' version is intermediate between the English versions of Prichard and the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* on the one hand, and the French *Catéchisme* of 1744 on the other.

In this *Catéchisme* we find in the first place that the number of searchers is reduced from fifteen to nine. Also, the searchers are for the first time Masters, a point to which I shall return later. Three of these nine Masters, having found the corpse,

> signaled the others to come toward them, and having all recognized their Master, they suspected it might have been some Fellow-Crafts who had done that mischief by attempting to force him to give them the Master's word; and fearing that they would have forced it out from him, first of all they decided to change it, and to pick out the first word one of them would utter when disintering the Corpse.[11]

So, here the recognition of the corpse as that of Hiram is mentioned explicitly, while also the suspicion of what might have happened is formulated. That makes the decision of the searchers to change the Masters' Word much more acceptable. However, at the same time it introduces a new problem: how acceptable is it to doubt the loyalty of Hiram, by fearing that he might have given the Masters' Word away? Yet, in France this became the standard version.

Meanwhile, a different variant was developing in England. The manuscript of the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois*, probably from between 1745 and 1750, which claims to be, and probably is, a French translation of an earlier English text, says:

> Not seing Hiram return as usual, Solomon let search for him in all the places where he thought he may be met with. Those in charge reported that something extraordinary might have happened to him, because a large quantity of blood was shed in the Temple and that Hiram could not be found. Solomon made a general call of the workers, at which were missing only the three brethren who retired when this order was uttered.… Then Solomon did not doubt any longer that they had authored the murder and he issued the strictest orders to have them chased and have them undergo the punishment of talion after having ascertained first that the strength of pain had not succeeded in wresting the Master's word from Hiram.[12]

So, here, the blood found in the Temple convinces Solomon that Hiram is killed, and the missing three Brothers make clear who did it. Besides, it is not assumed that Hiram would break his oath, though it is checked in order to be sure. When one of the Masters then finds the corpse of Hiram, and sees its posture, "he let his fellows take notice of it and from it concluded Hiram had not revealed anything" (il le fit remarquer à ses camarades et en augura qu'il n'avoit rien revelé). After Hiram is reinterred, it is Solomon who "ordered [the Masters] to keep these signs and tokens and use them during the completion of the building of the Temple" (Enjoignit [aux maîtres] de conserver ces signes et ces attouchemens pour s'en servir pendant le reste de la construction du Temple), but there is no question of these replacing the old Masters' Word.

The influence of this English ritual on the French ones is demonstrated by a French manuscript ritual, *Cahiers Concernant les Receptions et Céremonies* [*etc.*] of 1760, which combines elements of the two. At first it seems just the usual French version. Nine Masters are sent out to search for Hiram. Three of them find the corpse and report this to Solomon. He then orders them to fetch the body. So far there is nothing surprising about this version. But then, Solomon

inspects the workmen and finds three Fellow-Crafts missing, after which the text continues in the usual French way: the nine Masters decide to change the Masters' Word, because they fear that it was divulged.

Likewise, the French manuscript *Passus Tertius* of 1766 mentions the blood found in the temple, and it has the phrase, "they concluded with satisfaction that he had neither revealed nor divulged anything" (Ils augurèrent alors avec satisfaction, qu'il n'avoit rien révélé où divulgué). It has also, at the point where the actual raising of the body of Hiram is described, the paragraph:

> the attempt made by the Master while rising the body of our venerable chief, resulted in his middle finger pushed between the ribs, and the air confined in that part of the corpse came out through the upper part of the body, but with such a noise, that he that held him cried out: Ha! Had the Worshipful Master Hyram been still alive, I would believe and assert that he uttered Moabon.[13]

Compare this with:

> the Attempt he made forced his middle finger between the ribs, at once the air confined in that Corpse came out with such a noise, that he that held him cried out that had the Worshipful been alive, one would have believed that he uttered Moabon.[14]

This quotation is from the *Ecossais Anglois* again. These two French rituals thus clearly demonstrate the influence of the French translation of the *Ecossais Anglois* on later French texts. Still later ones[15] copy these items, thus demonstrating their lasting influence, but it seems that they never made it into the printed French versions,[16] so that eventually they disappeared again.

A radically different approach shows up in *Three Distinct Knocks*, also of 1760, but English. We have seen before that here there were at first not three but fifteen conspirators, twelve of whom withdrew before the crime was committed. These twelve play a crucial part in the episode we are looking at now.

> Our Master *Hiram* being missing, as he did not come to view the Work as usual, so King *Solomon* made great enquiry after him, and could not hear of any thing of him. Therefore he suppos'd him dead. The twelve Fellow-Crafts that had recanted, hearing the said report, their consciences pricking them, went and acquainted King *Solomon* with White Aprons and Gloves, as Badges of their Innocency; and King *Solomon* sent them in search of the Three Ruffians which had absconded.

Had, in the *Ecossais Anglois*, the identity of the murderers been assumed, only by their absence at the inspection, here they are positively identified by those who knew their plans, as was the case in the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740. Also, what has happened to Hiram is no matter of speculation now. Besides, like in the *Ecossais Anglois*, the twelve Fellow-Crafts first find the three murderers, whom they bring before Solomon, and who confess their crime and are punished. Only then are the same twelve Fellow-Crafts again sent out to fetch the body of Hiram. And then follows a most interesting new concept:

> *Solomon* told them that if they could not find a Key-word in him, or about him, it was lost; for there were but Three in the World that knew it, and it never can be deliver'd without we Three are together; but now One is dead, therefore it is lost. But for the future, the first occasioned Sign and Word that is spoken at his raising, shall be his ever after.

We saw before that in this ritual Hiram mentioned to one of his extortionists that "it was not in his Power to deliver [the Masters' Word] alone, except Three together, *viz. Solomon,* King of *Israel; Hiram,* King of *Tyre*; and *Hiram Abiff*." Therefore, Hiram not only should not, but even could not divulge it. The very new concept here is that therefore, the necessity to have a new Masters' Word stems not from any doubt of the fidelity of Hiram, but from the automatic loss of the old Masters' Word, now that one of the three, required for its pronunciation, had died, precisely *without* passing it on. This concept of three being necessary to pronounce the old Masters' Word—which, after all was the Name of God in Hebrew—may be considerably older than 1760. For example, the *Graham Manuscript* of 1726 mentions four times that it is necessary to be with three Masters to make a "trible Voice" to pronounce the secrets of a Master.[17] Also the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740 says that Solomon "did in solemn conclave communicate [this most precious name] to [his] royal friend King Hiram of Tyre, and also to our … Grand Master Hiram Abif" and "we so write it, that no one can pronounce it but he who receives it from living lips." And John Coustos still knew that "to [Hiram] alone was revealed the Sign which pertained to him as Master." So, it seems that we have here an aspect of the Hiramic Legend which may be older than Prichard; was not expressed by Prichard, but is neither in conflict with what he does express; was not known in France; but continued to be known in England.

At the same time it is remarkable to see again the idea: "if they could not find a Key-word in him, or about him," which reminds us of Prichard's sugges-

tion that the Masters' Word might be found "in him or about him"; the golden medal with the tetragrammaton of the *Rite de Ancien Bouillon*, which is found on the corpse of Hiram; and the suggestion by John Coustos that the secret might be found "on the body of the Master, or in his pockets." In other words, this element also is consistently present in all English versions and absent in all French ones. Besides, this too can be found as early as 1726 in the *Graham Manuscript*, which states:

> shem ham and Japheth ffor to go to their father noahs grave for to try if they could find anything about him ffor to Lead them to the vertuable secret which this famieous preacher had[;] for I hop all will allow that all things needfull for the new world was in the ark with noah[.] Now these 3 men had allready agreed that if they did not ffind the very thing it self[,] that the first thing that they found was to be to them as a secret they not Douting but did most ffirmly be Leive that God was able and would allso prove willing through their faith[,] prayer and obediance for to cause what they did find for to prove as vertuable to them as if they had received the secret at ffirst from God himself

These characteristics remain present in all later English texts.

In all the preceding versions, the place where Hiram was buried was found by accident. This is changed in the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* of 1782, which mentions: "three of them, attracted by the glitter of an extraordinary light, made for the height where the corpse had been interred" (trois d'entre eux allères par l'éclat d'une lumiere extra ordinaire se dirigèrent vers l'eminence ou le cadavre avoit été enterré). Apart from that, the Hiramic Legend of this first of the "Grand Rituals" is a typical example of the 18th century French rituals. The *Rite Moderne* of 1786 too has a natural phenomenon guiding the searchers to the grave.

> At sunrise, one of them noticed a vapour arising upon the fields at a distance; this phenomenon caught his attention; he acquainted the other masters with it and all of them came nearer to the place where the vapour came out from. At first glance, they noticed a small eminence, or hillock.[18]

Though in many details different from that of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié*, the Hiramic Legend of the *Rite Moderne* is, apart from this point, also an example of the form, generally found in the 18th century French rituals.

The second edition of Browne's *Master Key* in fact returns to the form of Prichard: only three conspirators from the start and "fifteen loving brethren"

being sent out to search for Hiram, though it is made clear that they are "fellowcrafts." There is no mention of the possibility that they might find the Masters' Word "in him, or about him," nor of the impossibility to pronounce it without the presence of three Masters. As an echo of that, it only mentions that "[Solomon] informed them that by [Hiram's] untimely death the secret of a master-mason was inevitably lost." This last statement is, rather surprisingly, also found in a French manuscript of 1803.

The Hiramic Legend of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, the third of the "Grand Rituals," follows, as we have seen, the English pattern, of which it is a perfect example. The most remarkable innovation is that it is said that the twelve Fellow-Crafts, sent out to search for Hiram, had "Solomon promised that they would be rewarded with the mastership if they reached the goal of their search" (la promesse de Salomon d'être récompensés par la maîtrise, s'ils parvenaient au but de leur recherche). This makes sense. In the French versions it is always Masters who go looking for Hiram; then there is no problem. In the English versions so far, the twelve Fellow-Crafts who bring back the new secrets of a Master Mason, by definition know them. Yet, the logical consequence that they are thus Master Masons from now on was not taken before. The only text which comes close to it is the *Ecossais Anglois*, c. 1745–50, which is a French translation of an English text. It has the (apparently numerous) Masters searching for Hiram (which may be a French influence), while the Fellow-Crafts find the murderers. Then this, unusually extensive, text tells that Solomon, after the completion of the Temple, "awarded the mastership to the most virtuous among the Fellow-Crafts and especially to those who had revenged the death of Hiram" (gratifia de la maitrise les plus vertueux des Comp et surtout ceux qui avoient vengé la mort d'hiram).

The *Emulation Ritual*, the fourth and last of the "Grand Rituals," follows, with respect to the variations discussed so far, the same English pattern. The main deviation is that Solomon did *not* send the twelve Fellow-Crafts who had recanted from the conspiracy to search for Hiram, but that he "selected fifteen trusty Fellow-Crafts" to do so. This will be inspired by Prichard's and Browne's "fifteen loving brethren."

4. The Murderers Found

The fourth part of the Hiramic Legend tells how the murderers of Hiram are found. Prichard says nothing with respect to what happened to them. The *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740 mentions that "the miscreants have fled, they have forfeited all claim to that which they might have obtained—they have become

wanderers on the face of the earth, and are for ever accursed." It is the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* which for the first time elaborates on this point. We have seen that it mentions that "Solomon made a general call of the workers, at which were missing only the three brethren who retired when this order was uttered" (Salomon fit faire l'appel général des ouvriers, au quel il ne manqua que les 3. freres, qui s'êtoient retirés à cet ordre). This fact is mentioned in some French manuscripts from 1760 onwards. But the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* is much more informative, giving the following account.

> The Fellow-crafts, distressed at the idea that workers of their own class had robbed Hiram of his life, begged of Solomon for the permission to revenge that crime, which he granted them while forbidding them to wipe the least trace of blood until revenge was accomplished. To that effect, he chose 60 amongst them, out of which 15 would stay to keep watch on the Temple[,] 5 at each door; 45 divided themselves into 3 groups, of which 15 went eastwards, 15 southwards and 15 westwards after they had agreed upon a special way of walking in order to distimguish the places they had passed as well as upon a special signal in order to join together if necessary.
>
> Those who walked eastwards met G[ubelas]. He admitted his crime. They submitted him to the same ordeal; they burnt his body and scattered his ashes in the wind. They arrived in Jerusalem on the 3d day after their departure and the 5th day after the death [of Hiram].
>
> G[ubelos] was met with in the South, after he admitted his crime, his belly was opened, his bowels were torn out and the whole was burnt together with his body, the ashes being scattered in the wind. These arrived in Jerusalem on the 5th day after their departure and the 7th day after the death.
>
> G[ubelum] was met with in the East and after having ascertained that the height of the torments had not forced the Master's Word from Hiram, his heart, his bowels & his tongue were torn out, his 4 members [his arms and legs] were cut off and exposed on fig-trees toward the 4 parts of the world, the rest was burnt and scattered in the wind. This group arrived in Jerusalem on the 7th day after their departure and the 9th day after the death.[19]

This text asks for extensive comments, but I will restrict myself. Let me just point out the introduction of an explanation for the imprecations, which formed part of the traditional oath since at least 1727.[20] Note also that the text, despite its extension, is clearly incomplete, for the statement "They submitted him to the same ordeal" (Ils luy firent subir la mesme peine) raises the question: the same

as what? Apparently this was assumed to be known, but not written down. What it refers to becomes clear from the next text which contains this element, which is *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760.

> One of those Parties travell'd down to the Sea of *Joppa:* one of them sat himself down to rest by the Side of a Rock, he hearing a frightful Lamentation in a Clift of the Rock. Oh! that I had had my Throat cut a-cross, and my Tongue torn out by the Root, and that buried in the Sands of the Sea at low-water Mark, a Cable's Length from Shore, where the Tide ebbs and flows [twice?] in 24 Hours, rather than I had been concerned in the Death of our Master *Hiram.* Says the other; Oh! that I had my Heart torn from under my naked Left-breast, and given to the Vultures of the Air as a Prey, rather than I had been concerned in the Death of so good a Master. But Oh! says *Jubulum,* I struck him more hard than you both, for I killed him; Oh! that I had my Body severed in two, one Part carried to the South, and the other to the North; my Bowels burnt to Ashes in the South, and the Ashes scattered before the Four Winds of the Earth, rather than I had been concerned in the Death of our Master *Hiram.*
>
> This Brother hearing this sorrowful Lamentation, hailed the other Two, and they went into the Clift of the Rock, and took them and bound them, and brought them before King *Solomon,* and they owned what had pass'd, and what they had done, and did not desire to live; therefore *Solomon* order'd their own Sentences to be laid upon them: Says he, they have sign'd their own Death, and let it be upon them as they have said.
>
> *Jubela* was taken out, and his Throat cut a-cross *&c. Jubelo's* Heart was torn from under his naked Left-Breast *&c. Jubelum's* Body was severed in two, and one Part carry'd to the South and the other to the North, &c.

Essentially the same text is also found in Browne's *Master Key*, and the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, while the *Emulation Ritual* shows a shortened version, lacking the *raison d'être* of this part of the story, namely the contents of the lamentations and the actual punishments as an explanation of the imprecations of the oath.

It is clear, then, that the finding and punishing of the murderers is an element which is found exclusively in the English rituals, which seems to have developed there after 1740. No French ritual has it, while all English ones do. This confirms the earlier findings that the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* is indeed a French translation of an English ritual, as it claims, and that also the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* is to be considered English rather than French.

To deduce now that this element from the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* left no traces in France, as opposed to the less remarkable ones which, as we saw, were copied in later French manuscripts, would be too hasty a conclusion. For it is clearly this element which was in France elaborated into a complete, but separate, degree: the Maître Elu. Traditionally it is assumed that this degree was created in Lyon in 1743, but there is no evidence available to substantiate this claim, and Paul Naudon argues that "Setting the date of the creation of the *Elu* degree —even in its primitive form of *Elu Ecossais*—as early as 1743 appears to us somewhat premature" (Il nous paraît quelque peu prématuré de fixer dès 1743 la création du grade d'*Elu*, même dans sa forme primitive d'*Elu Ecossais*, incluse dans l'Ordre des Ecossais).[21] I would agree with Naudon here and assume that it was the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* which, in its French translation, gave rise to the degree of Maître Elu. The first printed version of its ritual is that in *Les Plus Secrets Mysteres des Hauts Grades de la Maçonnerie Dévoilés*, first published in 1766. No doubt there are older manuscript versions, but lack of time prevented me from tracing them, so I don't know what is actually the oldest reliably dated version available right now.

5. Hiram Buried

The last section of the Hiramic Legend, the reburial of Hiram, is generally rather short. However, there are some significantly different versions. To start with Prichard again, he has the following text:

> Ex. What did King *Solomon* say to all this? R. He order'd him to be taken up and decently buried, and that 15 Fellow-Crafts with white Gloves and Aprons should attend his Funeral [*which ought amongst Masons to be perform'd to this Day.*]
>
> …
>
> Ex. Where was *Hiram* inter'd? R. In the *Sanctum Sanctorum*.
>
> Ex. How was he brought in? R. At the West-Door of the Temple.

I will deal with the point of the white gloves and apron seperately (see below). The more essential point is that, according to Prichard, Hiram was buried in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. Shortly after the publication of *Masonry Dissected*, this seems to have been changed, for the French translation of 1738 has only left: "in the inside (inner part) of the Temple" (dans l'interieur du Temple). The *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* does not mention the reburial at all. John Coustos stated "they took the body of the Master to the King, who ordered it to be

buried, … and upon his sepulchre there was ordered to be engraved the following = Here lies Hiram, Grand Master Architect of the Freemasons." And the *Catechisme* just mentions that "to illustrate his esteem for the memory of Adoniram, [Solomon] let him be interred with great pomp in his Temple" (pour donner des marques de l'estime qu'il avoit pour la Mémoire d'Adoniram, [Salomon] le fit enterrer en grande Cérémonie dans son Temple). A significant change is made by *Le Sceau Rompu* of 1745.

Q How was the body of our most respectable Master Adoniram disposed of?

A In order to reward his zeal and his talents, Solomon let him be buried in the Sanctuary of the Temple.

Q What did he order to be placed upon his Grave?

A A golden medal in the shape of a triangle, upon which was engraved JEOVA. Which is the name of God in Hebrew.[22]

Here we see a kind of restoration of what we saw with Prichard: Hiram is buried, not just in the Temple, but more precisely, in "the Sanctuary [Sanctum Sanctorum] of the Temple" (le Sanctuaire du Temple). This is copied in a significant number of the French manuscript rituals, though not in all. But *Le Sceau Rompu* also introduces an important new element: a golden triangle with the name of God in Hebrew is placed on the tomb. In the text of the rituals, this is new, but in the illustrations a prefiguration of it had been there for about a year. The word Jehova is found on the tomb even in the first picture we have of it, namely that in the *Catéchisme* of 1744. There is, in fact, an older text which mentions a plate of metal with the name of God. In 1743, the day after he told the Inquisition the Hiramic Legend, John Coustos declared that "when the destruction of the famous Temple of Solomon took place there was found below the First Stone a tablet of bronze upon which was engraved the following word, JEHOVAH, which means GOD," etc.[23] And even three years older than that, of course, is the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740, where we saw that Solomon stated that he "permitted [Hiram] … to engrave the most mysterious word upon a plate of gold within the cabalistic figure of [Solomon's] signet, and to wear it as an especial mark of [his] royal favour and goodwill."

All this seems to come together now in *Le Sceau Rompu* in 1745, from whence it is developed further. Interesting is the ritual of the *Ecossais Anglois*:

> The body of the Worshipf. was enclosed in a coffin and placed in a superb sepulchre erected in the Sanctuary, closed with a tomb-stone, in the center of which was a triangular golden medal with a blazing Star, in the cen-

> ter of which was the Letter G. The same Triangle was repeated in a baldachin suspended perpendicularly above the mausoleum.[24]

In an English ritual, the letter *G* is easily recognized to refer to God. In the French rituals we sometimes find this mentioned explicitly, but the use of the word *Jehovah* or of the tetragrammaton is more obvious. In *La Désolation des Entrepreneurs Modernes* of 1747 it is for the first time shown in the picture of the "tableau" (tracing board) of the Third Degree in the form of the tetragrammaton, and placed on a triangle. The text of this ritual mentions: "[Solomon] let him be interred with great pomp in the Temple of the true God and let be placed on his Grave a triangular Golden Medal on which was engraved: JEHOVAH" ([Salomon] le fit inhumer en grande pompe dans le Temple du vrai Dieu, & fit mettre sur son Tombeau une Médaille d'Or faite en triangle, où étoit gravé JEHOVAH). And in the version of Wolson from 1751 we read: "[Solomon] let him be interred with great pomp and all the honours, and the old [Master's] word, underneath two sprigs of acacia in saltire, was engraved on his grave" ([Salomon] le fit inhumer pompeusement avec tous les honneurs, & on grava sur sa tombe l'ancien mot [de Maître], surmonté de deux branches d'acacia posées en sautoir).

When we look now at the English texts from the 1760s, we see no trace there of the Golden Triangle with the Name of God. What we do see there, however, is that the specification of the place where Hiram is reburied as the *Sanctum Sanctorum* has been restored. In the formulation of *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760: "King *Solomon* sent those 12 Crafts to raise their Master *Hiram,* in order that he might be interred in *Sanctum Sanctorum*." This remains so in almost all later English texts.

Interesting with regard to this section of the legend is the version from the Amsterdam lodge "Concordia Vincit Animos" of 1761:

> [Hiram] was transported with great pomp into the Temple and, according to Solomon's order, he was displayed, until his funeral could take place in a distinguished place under the blazing star, and in order to give him the marks of respect he had deserved, he let the old Master's Word be engraved on a plate of bronze, and the coffin be decorated with sprigs of acacia, as the distinctive tokens which led to such a precious discovery.[25]

Clearly, this is influenced by the ritual of the *Ecossais Anglois* (the tomb placed under the Blazing Star), but also the Old Masters' Word is not placed on

a Golden Triangle, but on a "planche d'airain," the "tablet of bronze" of John Coustos. The predominant French version will, however, remain that which we see, for example, in the ritual of the Strict Observance of about 1762: "Solomon ordered magnificent funerals, let Hiram be buried in the temple, and had a triangular medal engraved upon his grave; on which was engraved the old Master's word with two sprigs of acacia in saltire" (Salomon ordonna des obseques magnifiques, fit inhumer hyram dans le temple, et fit graver sur sa tombe une medaille triangulaire, sur laquelle étoit gravé l'ancien mot de Maitre avec deux branches d'acacia en sautoir). The location of the grave is either "le Sanctuaire du Temple" or just "le Temple," the word in the golden triangle may be indicated as "l'ancien mot de Maître" (the old Master's word) or "Jehova[h]" or "le nom de Dieu (en Hébreu)" (the name of God [in Hebrew]) or any combination or variation of these, and the branch or branches of acacia may be mentioned or not. Also the "Grand Rituals" of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* and the *Rite Moderne* show this form.

The reburial in the "Holy of Holies" is mentioned in a French manuscript version from about 1780 (which has more characteristics, generally found only in the English versions) and in one of 1803.

A new move is made in (apparently both editions of) Browne's *Master Key*. Here, Hiram is reburied "as near the Sanctum Sanctorum as the mosaic judicial laws would permit" (ed. 1802), after which follows the question: "Why not buried in the Sanctum Sanctorum?" To which it is answered: "Because by the mosaic laws all men's flesh was deemed unclean so that no person whatever was permitted to enter the Sanctum Sanctorum but the High Priest alone, and not even him but once a year after many purifications and washings on the grand day of the expiation of sins." This argumentation was not new. It was forwarded in *The Perjur'd Free Mason Detected*, a rejoinder to Prichard's *Masonry Dissected*, published that same year 1730:

> *Mast.* … don't they tell you *Hiram* was buried in the *Sanctum Sanctorum?*
>
> *Jun.* Yes, and he was buried there to be sure.
>
> *Mast.* Yes, allegorically; but not really; … for you might easily know, a dead Body to have been buried in the Temple, would have polluted the Place, and the Jews would never have come into it again.

This argumentation may have convinced some members, who then were responsible for the change to have Hiram no longer buried in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, but only in the Temple.[26] However, this argumentation is based on

a misunderstanding of the import of the story and its function in the ritual. It should be clear by now that placing the name of God on the tomb of Hiram was a functional equivalent to his being buried in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. Both make clear that Hiram is in fact *Jahweh*.[27] It is precisely that which renders the third degree ritual an initiation of a very well-known kind: the candidate is identified with a hero, who turns out to be (a) deity. In that way, the ritual *Unio Mystica* between the candidate and the divinity is expressed and realized. Thus, this move by Browne removes the essence from the Hiramic Legend, rendering it only a moralistic story instead of an initiation myth. It thus is highly significant that this example of Browne was followed by the *Emulation Ritual*. This change is hardly a more serious mutilation of the Hiramic Legend than that which we find in the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, which just does not mention the reburial of Hiram at all!

V. Some Minor Elements

I shall now discuss the development and variation of some elements of the legend which do not influence the main structure, but which are more than just textual variations. At this level, there are certainly more elements which might be regarded as worth looking at, but in order not to get boring, I decided to select just some which I find fascinating personally.

1) Where is Hiram Buried?

Hiram is in all versions buried more than once. However, we may distinguish five places where his body remains or is intended to remain for a shorter or longer time.

1) Firstly, some versions have the murderers hide the body in or near the Temple under a pile of rubbish, because it is still day.

2) All versions have that it is buried somewhere outside the Temple, usually on a mountain, where it is later found. In some versions this grave is camouflaged by branches of acacia, but

3) other versions have the murderers place a sprig of acacia on this grave in order that they may later find it easily, because they want to bury it even further away and better.

4) When the body is found, some versions have it displayed a while in the Temple, before

5) it is finally interred in the mausoleum King Solomon made for it.

With the exception of the ritual of Lodge Concordia Vincit Animos (Amsterdam) of 1761, none of the versions, however, has all of these; most (including Prichard, the English rituals of the 1760s, and the Rectified Scottish Rite of 1782) have 1, 2 and 5; many (including John Coustos (1743), the *Catechisme* (1744), and the *Emulation Ritual*) just 2 and 5. The exceptions are as follows:

- The *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* (1740) mentions only 2.
- The *Ecossais Anglois* (c. 1745–50), has 1 = 2, 4 and 5.
- Wolson (1751) and the *Rite Moderne* (1786) have 2, 3 and 5.
- The English rituals of the 1760s have 1, 2 and 5, like Prichard, but mention also an unusual variant according to which Hiram was buried by the murderers in the Temple under a stone.
- The *Maçonnerie des Hommes* (c. 1760–65) and the Strict Observance (c. 1762) have 1 = 2, 3 and 5.
- *Passus Tertius* (1766) has 1, 2, 4 and 5.
- The ritual "Marquis de Gages" (c. 1767) and the *Recueil des trois premier grades* (1788) have 1, 2, 3 and 5.
- GON 122.C.40 (1776) and the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite (c. 1815) have just 1 and 2.
- The Rectified Scottish Rite, version 1778, and the *Recueil Précieux* (1785) have 1, 3 and 5.

So we see that there are in fact three more or less rare variants: 1 = 2; 3; and 4.

The first (1 = 2, i.e. the body is buried in or near the Temple under a pile of rubbish and left there) is found only in the *Ecossais Anglois* (c. 1745–50), the *Maçonnerie des Hommes* (c. 1760–65) and in the Strict Observance (c. 1762).

The second (3, i.e. the murderers place a sprig of acacia on this grave in order that they may later find it easily, because they want to bury it even further away and better) is found in Wolson (1751), the ritual of Lodge Concordia Vincit Animos (Amsterdam, 1761), the *Maçonnerie des Hommes* (c. 1760–65), the Strict Obser-

vance (c. 1762), the ritual "Marquis de Gages" (c. 1767), the Rectified Scottish Rite version of 1778, the *Recueil Précieux* (1785), the *Rite Moderne* (1786), the catechism of *Le Vray Maçon* (1786), and the *Recueil des trois premier grades* (1788).

The third (4, i.e. when the body is found, it is displayed a while in the Temple, before it is finally interred) is found only in the *Ecossais Anglois* (c. 1745–50), the ritual of Lodge Concordia Vincit Animos (Amsterdam, 1761), and the MS. *Passus Tertius* (1766). Exceptional are the ritual "Marquis de Gages" (c. 1767), *Franche Maçonnerie* (1786), and the *Recueil des trois premier grades* (1788), where the body of Hiram is brought into (but not displayed in) Solomon's chambers.

Each option seems to have its own path through history, while any combination seems possible.

2) Who Decides When to Change the Masters' Word?

There are two variants on who decided to change the Masters' Word: the searchers or Solomon. However, there is more variety as to when this decision was made.

With Prichard (1730), BN FM4.303 (1773–1785), and *Franche Maçonnerie* (1786), the searchers decide to change it before they depart to search for Hiram.

In GON 240.C.40 (1785) they decide to change it when they find the grave.

The *Catechisme* (1744) states that they decided so directly after finding the body. Usually it is then raised at once. In the *Catechisme* (1744) and *Franche Maçonnerie* (1786) it is apparently brought to Jerusalem at once too, after which all is reported to Solomon, but from the *Trahi* (1745) on, it is put back into the grave and only brought to Jerusalem after Solomon has ordered so. This remains the predominant French version.

According to John Coustos (1743), GON 240.C.33 (1760), *Récueil et Collection* [*etc.*] (1768), UGLE YFR.200.RIT (c. 1772), *Dépôt complet* [*etc.*] (1776), GON 240.A.76 (c. 1780), and *Clef du Trésor* [*etc.*] (1803), they decided so after Solomon had sent them out for the second time, this time in order to fetch the body.

As we have seen, the *Ecossais Anglois* (c. 1745–50) states that Solomon "ordered [the Masters] to keep these signs and tokens and use them during the completion of the building of the Temple" (Enjoignit [aux maîtres] de conserver ces signes et ces attouchemens pour s'en servir pendant le reste de la construction du Temple), but not as a replacement of the old Masters' Word.

In the English versions of the 1760s, it is Solomon who decides to change it after he has heard the report of the searchers. But here too, it is not really a replacement of the old Masters' Word, but a word which "shall be his [i.e. Hiram's] ever after" (*Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760).

The Rectified Scottish Rite (1782) combines the predominant French version (the searchers decided to change the word directly after finding the body) with the same decision by Solomon, just before sending them out again to fetch the body of Hiram.

In *Franche Maçonnerie* (1786) the decision to change the word, taken by the Masters before leaving to search for Hiram, is sanctioned by Solomon after they return to Jerusalem with the body. In the *Rite Moderne* (1786), too, Solomon sanctions the decision taken by the Masters, this time after they have found the body of Hiram.

It is only in *Le Vray Maçon* (1786) that Solomon orders the word changed, right at the point where he sends out the Masters to search for Hiram. This same form is also found in Browne's *Master Key* (1802), the first English version where the new secrets are presented as substitutes for the old ones:

> [Solomon] informed them that by his untimely death the secret of a master-mason was inevitably lost, but as a reward for their fidelity the casual sign, token and word, that should occur on the grave being opened and his upraising, should be substituted in their room, until future ages should discover the right.

Except for the final phrase "until future ages should discover the right," which is absent, the same form of explaining substitution is found in the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite (c. 1815) and the *Emulation Ritual*.

Remarkable is the *Recueil des trois premier grades* of 1788, where Solomon, after the body of Hiram has been brought to his chambers, "resolved to change the Words, and the nine Masters agreed that those they had uttered when raising Adonhiram's body shall be substituted in place of the old ones," (résolut d'en changer les mots, & les neuf Maîtres convinrent que ceux qui leur étoient échappés en relevant le corps d'Adonhiram seroient substitués aux anciens), whereas after the reburial of Hiram, Solomon "further ordered that the words, signs and tokens should be changed and confirmed those upon which the nine Masters had agreed" (ordonna en outre, que les mots, signe & attouchement seroient changé, & confirma le choix de ceux dont les neuf Maîtres étoient convenus).

3) Who Places the Sprig of Acacia on Which Grave and Why?

With Prichard (1730), the murderers hid the grave with shrubs. Once the searchers had found and opened it, they closed it again, "and as a farther Ornament placed a Sprig of Cassia at the Head of the Grave." In the *Rite Ancien de*

Bouillon (1740), the corpse is found “with a sprig of evergreen at his head.” According to John Coustos (1743), the grave was camouflaged with small bushes, but he does not mention the sprig of cassia or acacia. The *Catechisme* (1744) states that the murderers, “when he was interred, … cut off a sprig of an acacia nearby and planted it upon him in order to recognize the spot where he was whenever it would suit them” (quand il fut inhumé, … couperent une branche d’un Acacia qui étoit auprès d’eux, & la planterent sur lui, pour pouvoir reconnoître l’endroit où il étoit, quand bon leur sembleroit.) Illogical as it is, this remains the predominant French version.

As an exception, *Le Sceau Rompu* (1745), *Cahiers Concernant les Receptions et Céremonies* [*etc.*] (GON 240.C.33, 1760), BN FM4.143 (1766?), *Récueil et Collection* [*etc.*] (1768), *Dépôt complet* [*etc.*] (1776), GON 240.A.76 (c. 1780), the Rectified Scottish Rite (1782), *Le Vray Maçon* (1786), Browne’s *Master Key* (1802), the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite (c. 1815), and the *Emulation Ritual* state that the searchers placed the sprig of acacia (Browne: cassia) on the grave, just as in Prichard. Here there are still two alternatives. According to most of these, and in accord with Prichard, it is the searchers who, after having found the body of Hiram and having closed the grave again, place the sprig of acacia on the grave in order to recognize it when returning, after having informed Solomon. In BN FM4.143 and *Le Vray Maçon*, however, it is the first searcher, who locates the grave, who places the sprig of acacia in order to recognize the place after having fetched his comrades.

The English versions of the 1760s do not mention the sprig of acacia at all!

According to the ritual of Concordia Vincit Animos (1761), the murderers “set [on the grave] a sprig of acacia in order to recognize the spot, if there should be an opportunity to remove him farther without being seen” (planterent [sur la fosse] une branche d’Acacia, pour pouvoir reconnoitre l’endroit, si l’occasion se presentoit de le transporter plus loin, sans être apperçûs). But also, the searcher who had found the grave “planted there a sprig of acacia or of cinnamon” (y planta une branche d’Acacia ou de Canelle) before going to tell Solomon.

Several rituals mention also that the murderers placed the sprig of acacia, in order to recognize the place easier, because they intended to bury the body later further away (see subsection V.1 above, “Where is Hiram Buried?”).

4) Who Dresses When in White Apron and Gloves?

Many versions, such as the *Catechisme* (1744), *Le Sceau Rompu* (1745), *La Désolation* (1747), Wolson (1751), the ritual Concordia Vincit Animos (1761),

and the Strict Observance (c. 1762), do not mention the white apron and gloves, but quite a number do.

With Prichard (1730), "[King Solomon] order'd … that 15 Fellow-Crafts with white Gloves and Aprons should attend [Hiram's] Funeral." Essentially the same is found in the *Ecossais Anglois* (c. 1745–50), Browne's *Master Key* (1802) and the *Emulation Ritual*.

According to John Coustos (1743), "Solomon caused a command to be given to the Officers and Apprentices … that, wearing their Aprons tied to their waists, as their custom now is, and gloves on their hands, they should go to the said place and disinter the body." The same timing, but without the order by Solomon is found in GON 240.C.33 (1760): "the same Masters who had been searching for the body of O[ur] R[espectable] M[aster] H[iram] went [away] clothed with white gloves and white aprons in order to show that they had not soaked their hands in the blood of their Master" (Les mêmes Maitres, qui avoient eté à la recherche du corps de N. R. M. H. partirent en gands et tabliers blancs, pour marquer, qu'ils n'avoient point trempé leurs mains dans le sang de leur Maitre), and in the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite (c. 1815).

The *Trahi* (1745) states, that during the funeral of Hiram in the Temple, "all the Masters wore white leather aprons and gloves in order to show that none of them had polluted their hands with the blood of their chief" (tous les Maitres portoient des tabliers & des gands de peau blanche, pour marquer qu'aucun d'eux n'avoit souillé ses mains du sang de leur Chef). *L'Anti-Maçon* (1748), UGLE YFR.200.RIT (c. 1772), Philibert Bouché (c. 1779), *Réceptions aux VII principaux grades* [*etc.*] (c. 1780), GON 240.D.1 (c. 1784), and GON 240.A.73 (1787) have the same.

In the Rectified Scottish Rite (1782) the Masters, sent out to fetch the body of Hiram, "carried the body of our respectable *Master Hiram Abif* with a great pomp, all wearing white gloves in order to show that none had soaked their hands in the blood of their Master" (porterent le Corps de notre resp. *Maître Hiram Abif* dans le Temple avec une grande pompe portant tous des gands blancs, pour marquer qu'aucun d'eux n'avoit trempé ses mains dans le Sang de leur Maître).

The moment when the Masters so dress is shifted backwards even more in the *Rite Moderne* (1786), where they do so after having found the body, before reporting to Solomon.

As we have seen in the English versions of the 1760s, it is the "Twelve Fellow-Crafts that had recanted, … [who] went and acquainted King *Solomon* with White Aprons and Gloves, as Badges of their Innocency" even before starting to search.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

From the information I have presented so far, we may draw several conclusions.

1) In the first place it has become apparent that not only the ritual of the *Ecossais Anglois*, but also that of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, though available only in French, are in fact rituals belonging to the English tradition. For the *Ecossais Anglois* that is not surprising, since the text itself claims to be a French translation of an older English ritual; our research has only confirmed the correctness of this claim. As for the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, this conclusion may be more surprising for everyone but a few researchers.[28] To be sure, I have only looked at the Hiramic Legend; other parts of the rituals of the Craft Degrees do show equally clear French influences.[29] The origin of these rituals must be looked for in the West Indies at the end of the 18th century, where French and British Freemasonry were both very influential. Further research still needs to be done here.

2) A second conclusion may be that with the *Graham Manuscript* of 1726, Prichard's *Masonry Dissected* of 1730, the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of about 1740 and the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* of c. 1745–50 or slightly later, we have four quite different English versions of the Hiramic Legend, demonstrating how much experimentation there was with its form, not only before, but also after the publication of *Masonry Dissected*. This runs counter to the general assumption, that this publication put an end to all such experimenting, fixing the form by providing an easily accessible model. From what we have seen, it has become clear that the manuscript forms contain some features which are not found, or only implicitly hinted at, in *Masonry Dissected*, and which yet became part and parcel of the English tradition. However, they never made it to France. There Prichard, especially in its French translation of 1738, became the standard. From that, Travenol developed his *Catechisme* in 1744, which became the model for all later French developments.

3) That brings us to a third conclusion, namely that the English and the French developments of the Hiramic Legend seem to be mainly independent. Such elements as that there only three Masters, who had to be together to make a "trible Voice" to pronounce the Old Masters' Word, which was thus lost automatically once one of them had died, precisely because he had not revealed it to someone else; such elements, which belong to the oldest of the English tradition, were never incorporated into the French rituals. The same holds true for the reason why the death of Hiram is assumed, namely because there were orig-

inally more than three conspirators, who, suspecting what had happened, came forwards and reported to Solomon what they knew. This form, developed later in the English tradition, also remained restricted to that tradition, while in France the form was developed that the death of Hiram was concluded when the Masters who found his body, recognized it as that of Hiram. The first indication of this French form is found with John Coustos, who, as we have seen, combines English and French elements, as was to be expected. Also other developments are strictly French and were never adopted by the English. We may think here of the indication of the divine nature of Hiram by the placement of the Name of God on his tomb, either or not in a golden triangle, rather than burying him in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*.

4) With that, however, we come at the point of certain elements that *were* transferred from one tradition to the other. We have seen that the tetragrammaton on a golden triangle, placed on the tomb of Hiram, may well have developed from the golden medal with the tetragrammaton of the English *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*. In its turn, this development may be related to that of the degrees of Maître Ecossais and Royal Arch, as I have indicated elsewhere.[30] Of these developments we know very little yet, but it seems most likely that early English elements were further developed in France, one of the results of which, namely the degree of the Royal Arch, found its way back to England. Likewise, we have seen that the element of the punishment of the three murderers developed in England. The first ritual mentioning it, is that of the *Ecossais Anglois*. In France it was not incorporated in the Hiramic Legend itself, but it was elaborated upon in the separate degree of Maître Elu. Apart from these constructions of complete new degrees, there may well be influences in both directions on a much lower level, namely that of the precise wording of certain phrases. I have not yet investigated that, but such items, even though they are less spectacular, may be of great use for developing a key to determine the date and tradition of a ritual of which these are unknown.

5) Finally, we may conclude a few things about the four "Grand Rituals." As we have seen, the Hiramic Legend of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* and of the *Rite Moderne* are classical representatives of the French tradition, whereas those of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* and of the *Emulation Ritual* stand for the English one.

These last two, therefore, present in the main course of the Legend a much more coherent and logical story than is found in the French tradition. This richer and intellectually more satisfying form originated partly from the preservation of pre-Prichard elements, partly from innovations introduced between 1730 and

1760. In particular, the more dramatic form of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* is, in my opinion, very attractive indeed. As opposed to the *Emulation Ritual*, it also retains the full form of the finding and punishing of the murderers, including the text explaining the traditional imprecations, contained in the oath.

However, as we have also seen, at the end of the 18th century, the English form of the Hiramic Legend loses its necessary conclusion: the indication of the identity of Hiram with Jahweh by either his burial in the *Sanctum Sanctorum* or the placement of the name of God on his tomb, thus rendering the English versions no more than a moralistic lesson. That element was preserved in both the "Grand Rituals" of the French tradition. Since this last point is vital for its function as an initiation myth, the quality of the Hiramic Legend of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* and of the *Rite Moderne* must, for this purpose, be regarded significantly greater. It is to be regretted that the English tradition did not preserve the conclusion it used to have: the burial of Hiram in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. If it had, it would have been by far superior. Since it did not, we are forced to conclude that the English tradition fell victim to the loss of understanding of the masonic method, which characterizes the 19th century in general. Probably it is pure chance that the French tradition did preserve the essential structure. At the same time, we may regret that it was not influenced more by the developments in England with respect to the main core of the story. However, it may well be precisely the independency of the two traditions which saved the French rituals from the fate of the English ones.

Author's Note: *I wish to thank Wim van Keulen and Evert Kwaadgras of the Grand Orient of the Netherlands, Florence de Lussy of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and John Ashby of the United Grand Lodge of England for their invaluable help in getting access to the different texts of the Hiramic Legend.*

Editor's Note: *This article, with slight corrections, is reprinted with permission of the editors, from* ARIES, *special unnumbered issue "Symboles et Mythes dans les mouvements initiatiques et ésotériques (XVIIe-XXe siècles): Filiations et emprunts," Archè / La table d'émeraude, Paris 1999, 59–92.*

APPENDIX

Versions of the Hiramic Legend and Their Sources

BN = Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris
GON = Groot Oosten der Nederlanden (Grand East of the Netherlands), The Hague
UGLE = United Grand Lodge of England, London

English Rituals:

1730 Samuel Prichard, *Masonry Dissected*, London, in Douglas Knoop, G.P. Jones & Douglas Hamer, *The Early Masonic Catechisms* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press,1943 pp. 118–20; 2nd. ed., London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1963, pp. 168–70).

1740? *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*, in J. T. Thorp, *Masonic Reprints* IX, Leicester: 1926, pp. 22–31.

1745–50 *Ecossais Anglois ou le Parfait Maitre Anglois*, Kloss MS.25.25, GON 192.A.80 pp. 11–24; also in J. A. M. Snoek, "Retracing the Lost Secret of a Master Mason," *Acta Macionica,* vol. 4 (1994) pp. 42–47.

1760 *A Master-key to Free-Masonry,* London, UGLE A.795.MAS, pp. 23–4 (a translation of *Le Secret*, 1744).

1760 *Three Distinct Knocks*, London, in A. C. F. Jackson, *English Masonic Exposures 1760–1769* (London: Lewis Masonic 1986) pp. 100–5.

1762 *Jachin and Boaz*, London, UGLE BE.208.FRE MS c. 1800, pp. 81–93; also in A. C. F. Jackson: *English Masonic Exposures 1760–1769,* pp. 161–65.

1764 *Hiram or the Grand Master-Key*, London, UGLE A.795.HIR, pp. 57–60.

1765 *The Mystery of Free Masonry Explained* (Ch. 21 from *Every Young Man's Companion*, 4th ed.), UGLE A.795.GOR, pp. 422–24.

1765 *Shibboleth*, London, GON 199.A.28 pp. 33/4; also in A. C. F. Jackson: *English Masonic Exposures 1760–1769,* pp. 227–28.

1766 *Mahhabone, or The Grand Lodge Door Open'd*, Liverpool, UGLE A.795.MAH, pp. 57–60.

1766 Thomas Wolson (pseudonym), *Solomon in all his Glory*, London, GON 209.E.104 pp. 33–37) (a translation of T. Wolson, *Le Maçon Démasqué*, 1751).

1769 *The Free-Mason Stripped Naked*, London, UGLE A.795.UAR, pp. 45–50.

1798 John Browne, *Browne's Master Key*, London, GON 213.B.4; decoded transcription by E. N. Cartwright: UGLE MS BE.98.BRO pp. 10–11.

1802 John Browne, *Browne's Master Key*, 2nd ed., London, GON 214.A.9; decoded transcription by F. Sonnenkalb, Hamburg, 1922: GON 85.B.23 pp. 70–79.

c. 1815 *Guide des Maçons Ecossais, ou Cahiers des trois grades Symboliques du Rit Ancien et Accepté*, Edimbourg (Paris), GON 197.B.41 pp. 78–83, 90–91.

(This is the same as *Cahiers des 33 gr∴ de la Maçrie∴ Ecoss∴ rit ancien-accepté*, MS from c. 1810, preserved in the archives of the Suprême Conseil de Belgique, probably given by Grasse-Tilly at the occasion of its foundation in 1817; pp. 114–22)

(This is the same as *Collection Maconnique du Rit Ecossais … par le T∴I∴F∴* [*Charles*] *Borget, … année 1816*, MS. BN FM4.116–118 pp. 118:471–84)

1816/25 The *Emulation Ritual*, in Walton Hannah, *Darkness Visible*, 1st ed. (London: 1952), pp. 137–39 & 143–45).

French Rituals (also Belgian, Dutch, or German if the rituals are in the French language)

1738 Anonymous, *La Réception Mystérieuse*, GON 202.A.38 pp. 44–50; also the English translation in Harry Carr, *The Early French Exposures* (London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1971) pp. 30–32.

1743 John Coustos: Confession of 21 March 1743, in S. Vatcher, "John Coustos and the Portuguese Inquisition," *AQC,* vol. 81 (1968), pp. 50–51.

1744 G.L.C. Perau, *Le Secret des Francs-Maçons*, GON 202.A.39 pp. 91–96; also the English translation in H. Carr: *The Early French Exposures*, pp. 73–74.

1744 L. Gabanon (L. Travenol), *Catéchisme des Francs-Maçons*, GON 209.A.38 pp. 9–12 & 19–27; also the English translation in H. Carr: *The Early French Exposures*, pp. 96–98.

1745 *Le Sceau Rompu*, GON 209.A.39 pp. 66–68; also the English translation in H. Carr: *The Early French Exposures*, p. 225.

1745 *L'Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi*, GON 201.C.70 pp. 45–47 & 79–86; also the English translation in H. Carr: *The Early French Exposures*, pp. 255–259) (This is the same as GON 122.C.33: MS. *Réception du Maître*, Berlin 1771 pp. 11–15).

1747 L. Gabanon (L. Travenol), *La Désolation des Entrepreneurs Modernes du Temple de Jérusalem* (BN 16°H.548(1) pp. 10–13 & 25–29; also the English translation in H. Carr: *The Early French Exposures*, pp. 325–26 & 330–31. (This is the same as *Nouveau Catechisme des Francs-Maçons*, 1749 (GON 201.C.67 pp. 10–13 & 25–29).

1748 *L'Anti-Maçon*, GON 36.A.26 pp. 21–25; also the English translation in H. Carr, *The Early French Exposures*, pp. 392–94.

1751 Thomas Wolson (pseudonym), *Le Maçon Démasqué*, GON 36.C.2 pp. 61–67; also the English translation in H. Carr, *The Early French Exposures*, pp. 452–55.

1760 *Cahiers contenant les réceptions et cérémonies des Grades d'Apprentifs et Compagnons* [*et Maître*]. (Copied by Brönner from a French ritual of 1760; Kloss MS.23.2, GON 240.C.33 pp. 41–50) (the same as the rituals of Sébastien Charles de la Barre (from between 1774 and 1778), *Cahier concernant la Réception et Cérémonies de maître; 3. Grade*, pp. 7–16)[31]

c. 1760 *Ce manuscrit provient de la Bibliothèque de M^{r} Louis Melchior Treburel, (mon beaupère) président du Trib^{l}. civil de S^{t} Dié. ancien Ven∴ de la R∴ L∴ des amis inséparables des Vosges, O∴ de St∴ Dié∴ ; F∴ Le Brun M∴,* MS. of c. 1760, BN FM4.108 pp. 35–41.

c. 1760 *Rituels maç∴ de la L∴ du Prince de Clermont*, MS. of c. 1760, BN FM4.B.18 pp. 45–47.

1760–65 *Grade de Maitre Maçon* (Par échange avec Kloss), MS. of 1760 to 1765, BN FM4.365 pp. 8^{r}-14^{r} (The same as [*Maçonnerie des Hommes,*] *Cayers Maconiques. tom. 1er., grade de maitre*, National Library of Australia, Clifford MS. 1097/44, facsimile edition in: Latomia, no. 175 (1997), pages not numbered.)

1761 *Ouvrage d'A……… C……… et M…… M……*, GON 123.B.1, MS.863: the oldest rituals used by Lodge Concordia Vincit Animos, Amsterdam, pp. 22–27 + catechism (pages without number).

c. 1762 The rituals of the "Stricte Observance," MS. of 1775, published in J.-F. Var: "La Stricte Observance," *Travaux de la Loge nationale de recherches Villard de Honnecourt,* vol. 23 (1991), pp. 92–96.

1766 Th. G[ardet] de la G[arde]: *Passus tertius vel Magister perfectus secundum ritus observantiae legalis* [etc.], MS. of c. 1798, GON 122.E.76: pp. 5–11; contains a ritual of the 3rd degree of the ambulant lodge "Les Amis Fervens," Besançon, written in 1766. Only a few traces of the Strict Observance.

≥ 1766? *La Maitrise troisieme Grade*, MS. of 1766?, BN FM4.143 pp. 5^{v}–9^{r}, 11^{r}.

c. 1767 The ritual "Marquis de Gages," Mons, published by R. Désaguliers in *Renaissance Traditionnelle,* no. 57 (1984) pp. 47–73, esp. 54–61.[32]

1768 *Récueil et Collection de toutes les instructions de la maçonnérie en tous grads à l'usage du frere Bassand … reçû maçon le 15. fevrier 1761,* [*copié par Bassand en 1768*] (BN FM4.148 pp. 30–35, 41–52) (The same as *Collection de tous les grades de la Maçonnerie*, BN FR.14301 c. 1770 (1772?). The same as *Récueil Et Collection de toutes les instructions de la massonnerie En tous grades à l'usage du frere Gauthier … mis au net en l'année 5785*, BN FM4.162.)

c. 1772 UGLE YFR.200.RIT: MS. (no title; pages not numbered).

1773–85 *Grade de Maitre*, MS. of 1773 à 1785, BN FM4.303 pp. 40–42.

1776 *Dépôt complet des Connaissances de la Franche-Maçonnerie; 1776*, GON 122.C.40: pp. 130–135; MS with collection of rituals of the Grand Orient de France.

1778 Nerad. Herono [i.e. Honoré Renard], *Les trois premiers grad. uniform. de la maç.*, no place, no publisher, GON 202.C.26, Cahier des Dem[andes] pp. 29–33; Cahier des Rep[onses] pp. 21–27.

1778 The rituals of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié*, ed. du Convent des Gaulois, Kloss MS 6.H.4, GON 190.D.21, pages not numbered.

c. 1779 *Livre de la Bibliotheque de Philibert Bouché, de Cluny*, MS. of which the first degree is marked: "à L'orient de Dunkerque le 25e du 2e mois de la vraye Lumiere 5779∴ et de L'era vulgaire 1779./." BN FM4.168 pp. 137^r-141^r, 131^r.

c. 1780 *Premier Grade de Maître*. MS. of c. 1780, Kloss MS.23.27, GON 240.A.76: pages not numbered.

c. 1780 *Réceptions aux VII principaux grades de la Maçonnerie Rédigées pour l'usage de la R∴ L∴ des neuf soeurs, à l'O∴ de Toul*, MS of c. 1780, BN FM4.B.14, pages not numbered.

1782 The rituals of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié*: *Rituel du grade de maître franc-maçon pour le régime de la maçonnerie rectifiée redigé en Convent General de l'Ordre en Aout 5782*, GON: Dossier Wilhelmsbad II: 107.C pp. 5–7. (The same as *Rituel du Système Rectifié rédigé au Convent de Wilhelmsbad 1782. Grade de Maître*, Kloss MS.5.H.9, GON 190.D.24: pp. 28–33.)

c. 1784 *Instruction pour les trois premiers grades*, Kloss MS.31.1, GON 240.D.1: pp. 50–55. (The same as the first version from *Grade de Maîtrise Bleue—Histoire d'Hiram—Catéchisme et discours*, 1787, Kloss MS.23.21, GON 240.A.73 containing two manuscripts of the Hiramic Legend: pp. 3–6,12–17. (This is also identical to the second half of the "Discours Pour La Récéption de Maître" in the undated MS. *Rituel de la Loge Saint Napoléon des artistes réunis*, BN FM4.658 pp. 15^r-17^v)

1785 [Louis Guillemain de St. Victor], *Recueil Précieux de la Maçonnerie Adonhiramite*, [Premier Partie,] Philadelphie [Paris], GON 202.A.45 pp. 88–90.

1785 *Réception et catéchismes; 1. des Apprentifs, 2. des Compagnons, 3. des Maîtres*, Kloss MS.23.23, GON 240.C.40: pp. 6–10.

1786 The rituals of the *Rite Moderne*, MS of 1787, GON 213.F.73 ff. 119^r–120^v & 123^v-124^v, The same as MS. "vers 1789," BN FM4.71, which is the same as *Le Régulateur du Maçon*, Hérédon [Paris] 1801, GON 40.E.8 pp. 16–20, 26–28.

1786 *Franche Maçonnerie; Cahier contenant les grades de Maitre,* [*etc.*] L∴ de Garre, L'an de la Lumiere 5786, MS of 1786, UGLE YFR.200.FRA pp. 22–40; related to *Recueil des trois premier grades* 1788.

1786 *Le Vray Maçon ou Recueuil des differents grades de la maçonnerie; à l'O∴ de S∴ ; l'an de la V∴ L∴ 5786*, MS of 1786, BN FM4.45 pp. 11–20, 26–30, 32.

1787 Second version from: *Grade de Maîtrise Bleue—Histoire d'Hiram—Catéchisme et discours*, Kloss MS.23.21, GON 240.A.73 containing two manuscripts of the Hiramic Legend: pp. 3–6, 12–17; for the first version, see c. 1784 above.

1788 *Recueil des trois premiers grades de la Maçonnerie, sous la dénomination d'Apprenti, Compagnon et Maître; dédié a tous les V∴bles M∴es de LL∴ Régulières*, par un Ex-V∴ble a l'Orient de l'Univers, 1788, GON 43.C.32: pp. 141–56; related to *Franche Maçonnerie,* 1786.

1803 *Clef du Trésor Maçonnique*, MS GON 122.E.3 pp. 71–74.

NOTES

1. On the history and development of the degree of a Master Mason, previous to the introduction of the Hiramic Legend in the early 1720s, see J. A. M. Snoek, "The Earliest Development of Masonic Degrees and Rituals: Hamill versus Stevenson," in M. D. J. Scanlan, ed., *The Social Impact of Freemasonry on the Modern Western World*, The Canonbury Papers 1 (London: Canonbury Masonic Research Centre, 2002), pp. 1–19.

2. *Le Secret des Francs-Maçons* (1744); *Le Catéchisme des Francs–Maçons* (1744); *L'Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi* (1745); *Désolation/Nouveau Catechisme*, 1747/9; *L'Anti-Maçon* (1748); *Master-Key* (1760); *Recueil Précieux* (1783). Wolson (1751), and thus *Solomon* (1766), which is its English translation, UGLE YFR.200.RIT, c. 1772 and *Recueil des trois premier grades* (1788), use the name Adoniram, but do not include the usual discussion about this name. Sometimes other variants are used, like Adonhiram, Adomiram or Adoniram Abif.

3. See, however, M. L. Plaskow: "Not Hiram Abif but Hiram, King of Tyre," *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* (hereafter *AQC*), vol. 107 (1994), pp. 188–91.

4. Not so in *Le Secret* (1744), (and, thus, the first version in the *Trahi* (1745), which is copied from it, and *Master-Key* (1760), which is its English translation) where he *is* regarded to be that worker in metals.

5. That is, *Ecossais Anglois* (c. 1745–50), "Marquis de Gages" (c. 1767); *Dépôt complet* (1776); MS UGLE (1786)/*Recueil des trois premier grades* (1788); *Guide des Maçons* (c. 1815).

6. One MS. (*Le Vray Maçon ou Recueuil des differents grades de la maçonnerie; à l'O∴ de S∴ ; l'an de la V∴ L∴ 5786*, BN FM4.45) has two versions, of which the first one, which is more than six letter-sized pages long, elaborates only on what preceded the assassination of Hiram. This part takes even more than two letter-sized pages.

7. For many years it was thought that the first edition of *Le Secret des Francs-Maçons* was published in 1742. "Wolfstieg (29956) listed the following editions: 1742 Geneva, 8º [No other details]. . . ." (Harry Carr, *The Early French Exposures* [London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1971], p. 43). More recent research shows that the date is 1744. *See* Henri Amblaine (Alain Bernheim), "Masonic Catechisms and Exposures," *AQC*, vol. 106 (1993), pp. 141–53, esp. 143–44.

8. This situation has changed since the first publication of this article in 1999. Pierre Noël, "Les Grades Bleus du REAA; Genèse et développement," *Acta Macionica,* vol. 12 (2002), pp. 25–118, demonstrates that the Craft rituals of the A. & A.S.R. were created in France, probably in 1804, possibly by Jean-Pierre Monguer de Fondeviolles, probably for the lodge "la Triple Unité," as a mixture of the French traditional rituals, and those of the English "Antients," especially as published in *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760. He also shows that these two traditions start from very different presumptions, and that therefore the rituals which resulted from their combination are full of internal contradictions.

9. On the date of this undated edition, see: René Désaguliers: "Essai de recherche des origines, en France, du Rite Ecossais pour les trois premiers grades" (I) 2: "De la mere loge Ecossaise de Marseille à 'La Vertu Persecutée' d'Avignon et au 'Contrat Social' de Paris," *Rénaissance Traditionelle,* no. 54/5 (1983), pp. 88–101 (esp. pp. 88–9), and (II) "addenda et corrigenda" *Rénaissance Traditionelle,* no. 56 (1983), pp. 285–315 (esp. pp. 294–66, 298–99, 310–11, 313). However, R. Désaguliers did not take into account all the available evidence. For example, the Suprême Conseil de Belgique has a manuscript version of the A. & A.S.R. rituals of the Craft Degrees which it probably received from Grasse–Tilly at the occasion of its founding in 1817. This does not mean that the *printed version* of these rituals existed at this time, but it does prove that the *rituals* existed. What is more, the version of these rituals in this manuscript can be dated more precisely. The first toast is to "Napoleon le grand, Empereur des Français, … l'impératrice Marie Louise, son auguste épouse, ainsi que celle des Princes et Princesses de la famille impériale.…" This means that this version cannot be from before the marriage of Napoleon with Marie–Louise, daughter of the Emperor of Austria, on 1 Apr. 1810. At the same time it seems likely that, had their son, Napoleon II, later Duke of Reichstag, been born already, he would have been mentioned explicitly. Therefore, the ritual is probably from before 3 Mar. 1811.

10. P. Noël, personal communication, 7 June 1996.

11. firent signe aux autres de venir vers eux, & ayant tous reconnu leur Maître, ils se douterent que ce pouvoit être quelques Compagnons qui avoient fait ce coup là, en voulant le forcer de leur donner le mot de Maître; & dans la crainte qu'ils ne l'eussent tiré de lui, ils résolurent d'abord de le changer, & de prendre le premier mot qu'un d'entr'eux pourroit dire en déterrant le Cadavre.

12. Salomon ne voyant point venir Hiram suivant son usage, le fit chercher dans tous les endroits où il crût le devoir rencontrer. Ceux qu'il avoit chargé de ses ordres luy rapporterent que sans doute il êtoit arrivé quelque chose d'extraordinaire, parcequ'il y avoit dans le Temple une quantité de sang répandu et qu'on ne pouvoit retrouver Hiram. Alors Salomon fit faire l'appel général des ouvriers, au quel il ne manqua que les 3. freres, qui s'êtoient retirés à cet ordre … Salomon ne douta plus alors qu'ils ne fussent auteurs du meurtre et il donna les ordres les plus précis pour qu'on les poursuivit et qu'on leur fit souffrir la peine du talion, après s'estre assuré que la force des douleurs n'avoit pû arracher à Hiram le mot de Maitre.

13. l'effort, que le M^{e} fit, en relevant le corps de notre vénérable chef, occasionna qu'il lui enfonça le doigt du milieu entre les côtes, et aussitot l'air renfermé dans cette partie du cadavre sortit par le haut du corps, mais avec un tel bruit, que celui qui le tenoit s'ecria: Ah! Si le V^{ble} M^{e} Hyram eût été encore en vie je croirois et affirmerois qu'il eut proféré Moabon.

14. l'Effort qu'il fit luy enforca le doigt du milieu entre les côtes, aussitost l'air qui êtoit renfermé dans ce Cadavre en sortit avec un tel bruit que celuy qui le tenoit s'ecria que si le Respectable eut êté vivant on eut crû qu'il avoit proferé Moabon.

15. The Marquis de Gages' ritual has the inspection of the workmen from which it is seen that three are missing. A manuscript of 1772 has the blood found "sur le pavé mosayque." A manuscript of 1785 has three Fellow-Crafts missing from "l'attelier des Moabites."

16. Only the *Recueil des trois premier grades* of 1788 has the general inspection, where three from "l'atelier des Moabites" are found missing.

17. D. Knoop, G. P. Jones & D. Hamer, *The Early Masonic Catechisms* (1st ed., Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1943, pp. 83–90; 2nd ed., London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1963, pp. 89–96).

18. Au lever du Soleil, l'un d'eux apperçut une vapeur qui s'élevoit dans la campagne, à quelque distance; ce phénomène fixa son attention; il en fit part aux autres maîtres, et tous s'approchèrent de l'endroit d'où sortoit la vapeur. Au premier aspect ils virent une petite élévation, ou tertre.

19. Les Compagnons au desespoir de ce que la vie de Hiram avoit été ravie par des ouvriers de leur classe, prierent Salomon de leur permettre la vengeance de ce crime, ce qu'il leur accorda avec déffense d'effacer la moindre trace du sang jusqu'à ce que la vengeance fut accomplie. Il en choisit à cet effet 60, dont 15 resterent à la garde du Temple[,] 5 à chaque porte; 45 se diviserent en 3 bandes dont 15 partirent du côté de l'Or, 15 du côté du Midy et 15 du coté de l'Occ après estre convenu d'une marche particuliere pour pouvoir distinguer les endroits par où ils avoient passés, ainsy que d'un signal particulier pour se rallier s'il êtoit nécessaire.

Ceux qui marcherent du côté de l'Or rencontrerent G[ubelas.] Il avoüa son crime. Ils luy firent subir la mesme peine; ils brulerent son corps et jetterent ses cendres au vent. Ils arriverent à Jerusalem le 3e. jour de leur départ et le 5e de la mort.

G[ubelos] fut rencontré au Midy, après l'avoeu de son crime, il eut le ventre ouvert, ses entrailles arrachées et le tout fut brûlé avec son corps, les cendres jettées au vent. Ceux cy arriverent à Jerusalem le 5e jour de leur départ et le 7e jour de la mort.

G[ubelum] fut rencontré à l'Orient et après estre convenu que la force des tourments n'avoit pu arracher d'Hiram la parole de Maitre, on luy arracha le coeur, les entrailles & la langue, les 4 membres furent coupé et exposés aux 4 parties du monde sur des figuiers, les restes furent brulés et jettés au vent. Cette troupe arriva à Jerusalem le 7e jour de son départ et le 9e jour de la mort.

In the last paragraph, compare "his 4 members [his arms and legs] were cut off and exposed on fig-trees toward the 4 parts of the world" with "And afterward Joshua smote them, and slew them, and hanged them on five trees: and they were hanging upon the trees until the evening." Joshua 10:26.

20. *A Mason's Confession* of c. 1727: "under the pain of having my tongue taken out from beneath my chowks, and my heart out from beneath my left oxer, and my body buried within the sea–mark, where it ebs and flows twice in the twenty–four hours." But maybe *A Mason's Examination* of 1723 implies the same: "he swears to reveal no Secrets of the worshipful Fraternity, on Pain of having his Throat cut, and having a double Portion of Hell and Damnation hereafter." And even the *Edinburgh Register House MS.* of

1696, the very first Masonic cathechism we have, describes the Entered Apprentice sign thus: "under no less pain, which is then cutting of your throat, For you most [*sic*] make that sign, when you say that" (Knoop, et al., *Early Masonic Catechisms*, p. 31), which suggests that similar formulations oof imprecations may have been in use even then.

21. Paul Naudon, *Histoire, Rituels et Tuileur des Hauts Grades Maçonniques*, 3rd ed. (Paris: 1978), p. 85.

22. D. Que fit-on du corps de notre très-respectable Maître Adoniram?
R. Salomon pour récompenser son zéle & ses talens le fit inhumer dans le Sanctuaire du Temple.
D. Que fit-il mettre sur son Tombeau?
R. Une Médaille d'or faite en triangle, où étoit gravé JEOVA. Qui est le nom de Dieu en Hébreu.

23. *AQC,* vol. 81 (1968), p. 52.

24. Le corps du Resp fut enfermé dans un cerceüil et déposé dans un superbe Tombeau élevé dans le Sanctuaire, fermé par une pierre, sur le milieu de laquelle êtoit une medaille d'or Triangulaire avec une Etoile flamboyante, au milieu de laquelle êtoit la Lettre G. Ce Triangle êtoit rêpeté dans un Baldaquin suspendu perpendiculairement au dessus du mausolé.

25. [Hiram] fit [fut?] transporté avec grande pompe dans le Temple, et on l'exposa par ordre de Salomon, en attendant ses obsèques dans un lieu distingué, placé sous l'etoile flamboyante, et pour lui donner les marques d'honneur qu'il avoit mérité, il fit graver sur une planche d'airain l'ancien mot de Maitre, et fit décorer le cercueil de branches d'Acacia, comme les marques distinctives qui avoient procuré une dècouverte aussi précieuse.

26. Of course, it is a misunderstanding too that it would be possible to bury a corpse "as near the Sanctum Sanctorum as the mosaic judicial laws would permit" or even just "in the Temple" without "polluting the Place," as *The Perjur'd Free Mason Detected* rightly observes. So, this solution by Browne, copied by the Emulation Ritual, makes no sense at all.

27. For any 18th century observer, this would have been obvious from the first moment when Hiram is referred to as the Architect of the Temple of Solomon. After all, the Bible makes perfectly clear that the Architect of the Temple of Solomon was God, who gave the plans to David, from whom Solomon inherited both his throne and the obligation to build the Temple, according to these plans (1 Chron. 28).

28. For example, René Désaguliers, "Essai de recherche des origines. . . ."

29. See P. Noël, "Les Grades Bleus du REAA."

30. J. A. M. Snoek: "Retracing the Lost Secret of a Master Mason," *Acta Macionica* vol. 4 (1994) pp. 5–53, and "On the Creation of Masonic Degrees: A Method and its Fruits," in A. Faivre & W. J. Hanegraaff, eds., *Western Esotericism and the Science of Religion* (Leuven: 1998), pp. 145–90.

31. The series of 24 rituals preserved in the castle at Ecaussines (Belgian Hainaut), presently occupied by distant heirs of the Marquis (the Lichterveld family), belonged to the Chevalier de la Barre, whose name appears on the ritual of the "Puissant Irlandais, Prévot et Juge," 8th degree of the series, 7th Degree in the A. & A.S.R.

Sébastien Charles de la Barre (1753–1838) was initiated in the "Parfaite Harmonie" Lodge on December 21st 1774, in the presence of the marquis de Gages, Provincial Grand Master, with whom he had family connections by marriage. His Masonic career was brief: passed on January 3, 1775, then raised on January 30, 1775, he left Mons for the army. He appears as a member of a military lodge in Luxemburg in 1778. (J. J. Heirwegh and M. Mat-Hasquin: "Itinéraire intellectuel et gestion économique d'un noble hennuyer: Sébastien Charles de la Barre (1753–1838)" in *Etudes sur le XVIIIe siècle* 9 (1982) 117/8.)

There is no evidence he ever joined the higher degrees. Nevertheless the dates of his Masonic activities suggest that those rituals, particularly the Craft Degrees, were used in 1774–78. (Pierre Noël, personal communication, 7 June 1996.)

32. The date of this manuscript is disputed. The title page (compare *Renaissance Traditionelle,* no. 54/5 [1983], p. 102) mentions 5763, i.e. 1763. Paul Naudon argues that it could also be read as 1767 (*Renaissance Traditionelle,* no. 68 [1986], p. 305). I do not agree with Naudon on this point. But he is right in assertaining that 1763 is impossible. According to the same title page, the ritual was "dediée au … Marquis [de Gages, chambellent de ll: Majestes imperiales royalles et apostolique], grand Maitre de cette Loge [La parfaitte Harmonie, Etablie à l'orient de Mons]." However, in 1763 the Marquis de Gages was not yet a member of this lodge, and maybe not even initiated. In 1763, the Comte de Pailly was the Master of this lodge. Only in 1765 did the Marquis de Gages join this lodge, of which he was Master in 1765–66 and 1767–70. Only in 1767 was he appointed "chambellan de leurs Majestés impériales, royales et apostoliques." (Naudon, ibid.) Therefore, despite the clear indication 1763, the manuscript must be from the period 1767–70.